

~~ADMINISTRATIVE-INTERNAL USE ONLY~~

SALT - 40/76
9 September 1976

MEMORANDUM FOR: Deputy to the DCI for National Intelligence Officers
FROM: Chief, SALT Support Staff
SUBJECT: Intelligence Representation on VPWG
REFERENCE: Letter, Gen. Faurer to Mr. Lehman, same subject,
dated August 20, 1976

1. I believe that General Faurer's proposal to replace the CIA representative on the SALT VPWG with the NIO/SP or his deputy should be rejected.

2. As background, the following information is pertinent to the issue:

-- The VPWG, the working body of the Verification Panel, was organized by the NSC staff presumably under instructions from its chairman, then Assistant to the President for National Security Affairs Kissinger. The decision to have the intelligence representative furnished by CIA was apparently a conscious one, and there is no indication that the NSC staff is unhappy with this arrangement, including the manner in which intelligence information is incorporated into the VPWG process.

-- DIA and INR are represented on the VPWG, the former by OSD and JCS representatives, and the latter by the State representative. DIA and INR representatives often take part in VPWG discussions, particularly when intelligence information -- or judgments concerning US monitoring capability -- have important impacts on upcoming policy decisions.

-- Intelligence contributions in which coordinated CIA/DIA views are essential, e.g., assessments of US capabilities to monitor various SALT provisions, intelligence relating to compliance issues, and data which are to be used by the US SALT Delegation in Geneva, are always coordinated outside the direct VPWG process.

*-- VPWG papers almost without exception go through several iterations. The intelligence input, regardless of its initial source

~~ADMINISTRATIVE-INTERNAL USE ONLY~~

ADMINISTRATIVE-INTERNAL USE ONLY

-2-

(normally CIA or DIA) is thoroughly massaged before the final version is forwarded to the VP for policy discussions and eventual decision. There is no single instance I can recall where differing views within the intelligence community have not been thoroughly vetted in the VPWG prior to Verification Panel deliberations on SALT policy issues requiring a decision.

-- The NIO/SP currently supports the DCI during Verification Panel deliberations, including the presentation of intelligence briefings. When known, differing views within the intelligence community on intelligence matters of interest to the Panel are presented as part of the briefings. Items included in the briefings are normally published first in the NID, with opportunity for DIA to register any difference, though it cannot be excluded that a fast-breaking item might be briefed on the basis of CIA findings alone. DIA views -- as well as those of other DoD intelligence agencies such as FTD -- are known to and used by both the Deputy Secretary of Defense and the Chairman, Joint Chiefs of Staff.

* 3. In support of his proposal, General Faurer infers that all draft intelligence contributions to the VPWG -- and apparently all SALT related intelligence -- should be coordinated within the intelligence community prior to submission. While such a procedure for all VPWG papers would be desirable, in practice it is usually impossible. Most VPWG papers have very short deadlines and are drafted by ad hoc groups or individuals in the SALT community. Initial drafts usually contain the views of the authors and are completely uncoordinated, even within the authors' parent organizations. Intelligence inputs to these initial drafts are usually taken from existing coordinated intelligence, such as NIE's or previous VPWG studies, or provided by CIA or DIA (when the authors are from DoD) in the absence of such material. Coordination is effected as the papers progress into final form. In practice, this procedure has worked very well.

4. General Faurer cites as an example of improper CIA actions in the SALT VPWG the briefing earlier this summer by the CIA representative of preliminary results of a contractor study on Backfire Performance. As you know, the decision to present this briefing to the VPWG was made by the DDI and the DDS&T and cleared with the DCI. This briefing would have been given regardless of whether or not the VPWG intelligence representative wore a CIA or NIO hat. In this respect, it should be noted that DIA (and DoD) has widely circulated the FTD SS-X-20 range/payload analysis without prior coordination with CIA, and with the knowledge that CIA has major problems with the analysis. In the final analysis, individual intelligence agencies will almost certainly continue to publish their findings on intelligence subjects related to SALT without prior coordination with other members of the community. And this is as it should be.

ADMINISTRATIVE-INTERNAL USE ONLY

~~ADMINISTRATIVE-INTERNAL USE ONLY~~

-3-

5. In sum, it appears to me that General Faurer's proposal is based, at a minimum, on a mistaken understanding of the VPWG process. Speaking personally, I can't help but feel that this is yet another attempt by DoD to mute the voice of CIA in the SALT arena.



DISTRIBUTION:

Orig & 1 - Addressee
1 - DDI
1 - DDS&T
1 - NIO/SP
1 - NIO/CF
1 - D/OWI
1 - AD/OSR
1 - Chief, SALT Staff

~~ADMINISTRATIVE-INTERNAL USE ONLY~~